

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/660,213	09/11/2003	Darren T. Sapashe	CM06328J	6551	
24273 MOTOROLA	7590 07/14/200 INC	EXAMINER			
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD			FAULK, DEVONA E		
IL01/3RD SCHAUMBU	RG, IL 60196		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2615		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/14/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

APT099@motorola.com Docketing.Schaumburg@motorola.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/660,213	SAPASHE ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	DEVONA E. FAULK	2615		

	DEVONA E. FAULK	2615					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706,07(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropriat	e extension fee				
have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the property of the pr	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t They raise new issues that would require further cor They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•					
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov 		be entered and an ex	planation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	tion of Annual will not	he entored				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after en	itry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
A.F							
Nivian Chin/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2615							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Regarding the specification objection, the applicant asserts that the specification provides anteredent basis for "monitoring only background noise levels' and monitoring subsequent background audio level alone" on page 2, lines 18-21. Page 2, lines 18-21 states that "In accordance with the present invention, there is provided herein an improved automatic volume control (Aberburgue 19-22). The present invention there is provided herein an improved automatic volume control (Aberburgue 19-22) technique for a communication device. In accordance with the present invention, an intelligent automatic volume control technique takes a measurement of the environment (background noise) at the time a user manually selects the volume. A user preference of the unuse setting made relative to the background noise experienced is thus established. "The examiner asserts that this does not read on "monitoring only background audio level alone". The examiner is maintaining the speciation objection and the associated claim objection. The examiner stands by the interpretation of the claim used in the rejection (monitoring subsequent background noilion fewels) and monitoring background noilion levels).

Regarding prior art Cooper, the applicant asserts that Cooper fails to teach of switchably engaging a microphone. The examiner disagrees, cooper teaches in column 4, tines 21-32 that "In accordance with the present invention, the ambient noise level is first examined in step \$101, if the ambient noise level is found not to have changed at all or not enough to constitute a change (no in step \$102), then the microprocessor 12 skips ahead to step \$105, and no action is taken. However, if a new ambient noise level betteed (yes in step \$102), then microprocessor fetches audio parameters for the new level from the personality storage (either EE/ROM or flash memory) (step \$103), in step \$104, these parameters are assembled into a message, which is then sent to the DSP E2.

The ambient noise level checked in step S101 is determined in accordance with either the volume setting (determined by the position of the volume knob) or a direct sampling of ambient noise using the digitized microphone audio input 22. With respect to determining the volume setting, it is assumed that a high volume setting is indicative of a high ambient noise level. The microprocessor accesses an audio parameter table including the audio parameters stored in the EEPROM 16 and/or flash memory 18 in accordance with the volume setting or the sampled ambient noise level.

Therefore Cooper teaches of an implied switching or selectively engaging a microphone which reads on the claim language.

The remainder of the applicant's arguments are most since the assertions for those arguments revolve around "monitoring only background noise levels' and "monitoring subsequent background audio level alone" which, as noted above, the examiner has interpreted as "monitoring background noise levels" and monitoring subsequent background audio level" due to the lack of antecedent basis.